REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

1. Double Patenting Rejection

An appropriate terminal disclaimer accompanies this response as recommended by the Examiner.

2. Section 103 Rejection based on Aziz in view of Hughes

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 11 based upon U.S. Patent 5,548,686 to Aziz et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,122,372 to Hughes. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant feels that the Examiner has not fully considered the arguments set forth in Applicant's previously submitted Preliminary Amendment accompanying the filing of this continuation application. The Examiner has repeated the arguments and specific references made in the parent application (Serial No. 09/267,449, now U.S. Patent No. 6,678,270), without addressing Applicant's arguments in the Preliminary Amendment. Applicant believes that the remarks may have been inadvertently overlooked or misplaced and therefore has repeated some of these remarks herein.

Applicant's invention contains a processed packet store. As the term indicates, the processed packet store is used to hold packets once they have been processed by the packet processor (see Application: page 5, lines 21–25 and page 6 line, 13 – page 7, line 2). The Examiner indicates that Aziz discloses a processed packet store at column 34, lines 31-45. However, this section describes a stored table for determining whether or not to encrypt packets that are passing through the packet processor. This stored table, name or functionality, is NOT a processed packet store as described in the present application. Further, while Aziz describes the

storage of other things, such as an encryption key or instructions, Aziz does not describe the storage of packets either before or after processing.

Applicant further believes that Hughes does not disclose the processing of a packet together with a hash value for a previous packet. Hughes does disclose the generation of hash values. Hughes also discloses that the hash algorithm used is determined by a previous portion of the message. In Hughes, the particular hash algorithm is determined by the message ID and applied to the rest of the message (step 916, Figure 9). (The Examiner assumes that the source to the "Hash Algorithm ID", is an earlier part of the message string, which Hughes does not expressly state. In fact, the "Hash Algorithm ID" could be stored anywhere in the message string and might be a later arriving portion). Hughes therefore teaches selecting the particular hash algorithm based on previous portion of the message, and then processing the rest of the message in the string with that hash algorithm. This is completely different then the current invention in which the hash value of the current packet is based on the hash value of a previous packet (i.e. the result of the hash algorithm). The current invention therefore, among other things, preserves the integrity of the sequence of packets, which Hughes does not do. Applicant further points out that Hughes does not even use the word "packet" or any equivalent thereto within the description of invention or claims. It is therefore difficult to see how Hughes can teach or suggest the current invention.

Since (i) Aziz does not disclose a processed packet store, and (ii) Hughes does not disclose the calculation of hash value for a current packet based on the hash value of a previous packet, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable in their current form.

It would also not have been obvious to one skilled in the art of data packet monitoring to combine Aziz and Hughes. Aziz, like the current invention, deals with data packets. Hughes, on

the other hand, deals with full string messages – that is to say that it deals with messages at a higher level, once the packets have already been assembled. In particular, Hughes deals with SGML text (see Hughes, column 8, lines 35 – 56). Further, Aziz deals with data encryption and Hughes deals with data integrity verification. While both patents are in the realm of data manipulation, this is a very broad field with many sub-specialties. Since Aziz and Hughes deal with data at different levels (packet versus strings) and for different purposes (encryption versus integrity) it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine these two references.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 7 are now allowable. Dependent claims 2-6 and 7-11 are therefore also allowable.

****

It is respectfully submitted that all claims in the application are allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections are respectfully requested. Favorable notice to this effect and early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the examiner have any questions and in order to expedite prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 8, 2005

Stuart D. Rudoler, Reg. No. 45,059
Attorney for Applicants
Stuart Rudoler LLC
2 Bala Plaza, Suite 300
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004
Tel: 610-660-7753; Fax: 267-200-0796